

R e m a r k s

The application includes pending claims 1-12, 54-63, 65, 81-90 and 92-113. The claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) with reference to Guenther et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,239,700) in view of Conway et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,214,793). Guenther et al. discloses a multi-choice or menu-driven information system for a motor vehicle. Conway et al. discloses an electronic billboard and vehicle traffic control communication system.

The independent claims 1 and 65 are directed to a technique for use in a vehicle including an engine compartment, wherein information about components in the engine compartment is displayed in an arrangement corresponding to their arrangement in the engine compartment. In response to the rejections of claims 1 and 65, the applicant respectfully maintains that Guenther et al. does not disclose, suggest or motivate a corresponding display. Among components differentiated in column 6, lines 24-68 and figures 1-3, such as a speech memory, speech synthesizer, clock, radio, loudspeaker, mobile telephone, talk-in device, CD player, location navigation system, alarm system and vehicle test equipment, it is only the latter that may possibly relate to the engine compartment. Moreover, even with respect to those components that Guenther et al. is concerned with, there is no disclosure of a display arrangement maintaining substantially the same relation as between the components. Without differentiation of components *within* the engine compartment, Guenther et al. lacks disclosure, suggestion or motivation of the applicant's claimed display arrangement, and this lack is supplied neither by Conway et al. nor by Guenther et al. elsewhere, including column 13, lines 34-59 and figure 6. The combined references would not have rendered the subject matter of claims 1 and 65 as obvious to a person of ordinary skill.

The independent claims 54 and 81 are directed to a technique for use in a vehicle, for adjusting the position

of an item in the vehicle along a track by an actuator, as a function of the extent of movement of an indicator. In response to the rejections of claims 54 and 81, the applicant respectfully maintains that, in mentioning interactive control of an item, Guenther et al. fails to suggest or motivate adjustment as a function of the extent of movement of an indicator. At column 16, lines 13-67, specifically at line 61, Guenther et al. merely mentions "interactice control". At column 13, lines 5-44 there is mention of "buttons" suggesting on-off switching rather than positioning as a function of extent of movement of an indicator, thus teaching away from the applicant's claimed invention. With Conway et al. included, the combined references would not have rendered the subject matter of claims 54 and 81 as obvious to a person of ordinary skill.


The independent claims 60 and 87 are directed to a technique for use in a vehicle, wherein indicators for sources of entertainment programs are presented as arranged according to entertainment categories, with categorization being provided by the sources and with the indicators being selectable. In response to the rejections of claims 60 and 87, the applicant respectfully maintains that Guenther et al. neither suggests nor motivates use of entertainment categories, neither at column 11, lines 17-61, nor column 12, lines 4-66, nor elsewhere. At column 11, line 43, selection is simply that of a specific radio station. And even though entertainment programs may have been arranged according to entertainment categories in program listings, for example, this did not result in selectable indicators, based on categories provided by the program sources. With Conway et al. included, the combined references would not have rendered the subject matter of claims 60 and 87 as obvious to a person of ordinary skill.

The independent claims 62 and 89 are directed to a technique for use in a vehicle, wherein groups of representations of entertainment sources are stored according to geographic areas, with a first group being presented as associated with a first area in which the

vehicle is in, and a second group being retrieved from memory when the vehicle is within a predetermined range of an associated second area. In response to the rejections of claims 62 and 89, the applicant respectfully maintains that Conway et al., column 17, lines 29-51 and figure 11 neither suggests nor motivates first and second groups of representations of entertainment sources, let alone their sequential presentation and retrieval. With Guenther et al. included, the combined references would not have rendered the subject matter of claims 62 and 89 as obvious to a person of ordinary skill.

With the independent claims 1, 54, 60, 62, 65, 81, 87 and 89 being allowable over the prior art, the dependent claims 2-12, 55-59, 61, 63, 82-86, 88, 90 and 92-113 are allowable even without regard to additional distinguishing features, and the applicant respectfully request allowance of the application with claims 1-12, 54-63, 65, 81-90 and 92-113.

Respectfully submitted,



Alex L. Yip
Patent Office Reg. No. 34,759

Peter A. Businger
Patent Office Reg. No. 27,862

Attorneys for Applicant
212-968-1300

Date: January 25, 2000